



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,872	02/02/2001	Richard Bullock	ESM00-001	7976
2352	7590	02/23/2004	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			BOOTH, RICHARD A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2812	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 09/773,872	Applicant(s) BULLOCK ET AL.
	Examiner Richard A. Booth	Art Unit 2812
<b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b>		
<p>THE REPLY FILED 02 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>		
<b>PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]</b>		
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.		
b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.		
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p>		
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</li> <li>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li> </ul>		
<p>NOTE: _____. </p>		
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). </p>		
<p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The a)<input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b)<input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. </p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. </p>		
<p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)<input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b)<input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. </p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>		
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____. </p>		
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____. </p>		
<p>Claim(s) rejected: _____. </p>		
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved or b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. </p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____. </p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. </p>		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the recrystallization of the polysilicon layer will still leave a rough surface since it is well known that polysilicon as-deposited will be a rough surface as opposed to amorphous silicon as-deposited. Also, note that the semiconductor layer is still referred to as polycrystalline in a later step (see col. 17-lines 42-52). Regarding the fact that the polysilicon layer not being changed prior to forming the gate insulator is not shown, this feature is not specifically claimed in the application. The polysilicon layer will still be "rough" when the gate insulator is deposited thereon. With respect to Kuo teaching performing a high temperature anneal to only the source/drain regions, the fact that the anneal of the gate oxide is not explicitly stated does not take away from the fact that the anneal will inherently take place since the oxide is already present on the device. Concerning the Yamazaki reference, this argument is a piecemeal argument since the Yamazaki reference is not relied upon to show the disputed features..

*Richard A. Booth*  
Richard A. Booth  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2812